

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion.

Claims 24-26 and 28-36 are pending. Claims 24-26 are amended, new dependent claims 28-36 are added, and claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21-23 and 27 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the changes to the claims is self-evident from the originally filed disclosure, including the original claims, and therefore no new matter is added.

In the Office Action, the claims are rejected as anticipated by or obvious over U.S. patent 4,505,236 to Nakamura, alone or in view of U.S. patent 6,755,172 to Neubock et al. (Neubock). It is requested that the rejections of the claims be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed, for at least the following reasons.

It is submitted that Nakamura, whether alone or in combination with Neubock, does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of "the first rocker shaft pedestal is disposed between the first and second rocker arms that are mounted on the rocker shaft without another rocker shaft pedestal disposed between the first and second rocker arms," as recited in independent claim 24.

Nakamura is directed to a valve operating arrangement of an internal combustion engine. The Office Action, on page 3, seems to assert that the rocker arms 130 that are disposed on a same one of the rocker shafts 128 of Nakamura are analogous to the claimed rocker arms on a rocker shaft, and that one of multiple portions of the frame-like supporting member 98 supporting that rocker shaft 128 of Nakamura is analogous to the claimed rocker shaft pedestal. Even assuming that these assertions are correct, it is

submitted that because Nakamura discloses multiple portions of the frame-like supporting member 98 disposed between the rocker arms 130 mounted on that rocker shaft 128, Nakamura does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of “the first rocker shaft pedestal is disposed between the first and second rocker arms that are mounted on the rocker shaft without another rocker shaft pedestal disposed between the first and second rocker arms,” as recited in independent claim 24. Please see, for example, Figures 5 and 11 of Nakamura.

Neubock, which Applicant submits is erroneously relied on to disclose claimed features of the top deck of the cylinder head, does not remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Nakamura. Therefore, it is requested that the rejection of independent claim 24 be withdrawn for at least these reasons, and that independent claim 24 be allowed.

The remaining claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 24 from which they depend, as well as for their own features that are not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Nakamura and Neubock. The withdrawal of the rejections, and the allowance, of dependent claims 25, 26 and 28-36 is therefore requested.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 26, 2008

By: 
Philip J. Hoffmann
Reg. No. 45,340